



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/655,811

09/05/2003

Carey E. Garibay

BEAS-01454US2

7109

80548

7590

07/07/2008

Fliesler Meyer LLP
650 California Street
14th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94108

EXAMINER

JOHNS, CHRISTOPHER C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3621

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/07/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/655,811	Applicant(s) GARIBAY ET AL.	
	Examiner Christopher C. Johns	Art Unit 3621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/18/08</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12 May 2008 has been entered.

Acknowledgements

2. Applicants' amendment is sufficient to overcome the original objections to the claims and the original rejections of claims 21-30.
3. Claims 1-30 have been examined and are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
6. As per claims 1, 11, and 21, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not understand what is meant by the terms "whether to allow the member to change the IP address at which the owner of the software license is locked". It would be unclear to a person having

ordinary skill in the art whether the member would be able to change the IP address of the computer that is currently locking the license, or change the stored IP address for the license.

7. Claims 2-10, 12-20, and 22-30 are rejected as being dependent upon one of the independent claims mentioned above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication 2004/0158709 (hereafter "Narin"), in view of Microsoft Windows Media Player, further in view of Wolfram MathLM, as referenced in "Mathematica 4 Documentation".

10. As claims 1-30 are best understood by the Examiner, Narin claims:

11. maintaining digital records of software licenses for multiple groups (§136 – “a directory lists for each requestor not only the identifier thereof but also the identifier of each group/cluster/division/platform/other entity/etc. that the requestor is a member of”), the digital records indicating rights (Figure 3, reference number 308) associated with software licenses (Figure 3, reference number 310);

12. accessing a group administration application to set access rules for members of a group, controlling access of digital record data of the group by members of the group (§119 – “In such a

situation...a rights template is created that the user can repeatedly employ in connection with creating rights labels...[to apply to sets] of users or classes...”; ¶123 – “rights template may be used to limit the scope or type of rights labels that can be created...may be pre-defined as policy that a particular user should always publish content to a particular class of users only...”);

13. using access rules to determine whether to allow a member of the group to view digital record data (inherent in the art of digital rights management, as this allows the system to protect the data it attempts to protect; also see ¶60 - “a content owner...wishes to restrict what the user can do with such distributed digital content...may wish to restrict the user from copying and re-distributing such content to a second user...”; ¶62 – “allows an owner of digital content to specify license rules that must be satisfied before such digital content is allowed to be rendered on a user’s computing device...”; finally, see generally ¶48, ¶49, ¶58-67, ¶71, and ¶72);

14. when the member is allowed to view the digital record data, displaying the data including displaying a right associated with one of the software licenses (Narin does not explicitly disclose that a member allowed to view the digital record data is also able to see the rights associated with the license. Microsoft Windows Media Player discloses a way for users to view the rights that have been granted – see “Microsoft Windows Media – Troubleshooting Windows Media Player 9 Series Error Messages” (hereafter WMP), subheading “C00D2720: Cannot copy the file”.

WMP teaches this to allow users to know which rights that they are afforded for any file. This allows the user to understand what he may and what he may not do with said file. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention in Narin to allow users to view the rights they are afforded (as in WMP) because it would allow a more usable and convenient system for the users. Allowing users to know which

Art Unit: 4137

rights they have in a certain file has the advantage of allowing users to understand which files may be copied and which may not be copied – a person having ordinary skill in the art would appreciate this as an advantage because it enables a more informative system);

15. displayed right indicating an IP address at which software associated with the one of the software licenses is locked, modifying the IP address at which the one of the software in response to member input is locked (neither Narin, WMP, nor the combination of the two references explicitly teach showing the IP address or allowing the IP address to be changed. The Examiner contends that having so-called “network licenses” or “site licenses” for software, viewing the addresses of the computers which are locking the licenses, and changing the locked addresses were all well-known to those skilled in the art at the time of the invention. MathLM teaches showing the IP address of the computers which have locked licenses (it shows hostnames, which are directly correlatable to IP addresses, see “Using MonitorLM”, page 2, figures 1 and 2, column “Hostname”; also page 7, “%PROC_IP” field), and the ability to allow or restrict users from obtaining licenses (see “Writing a Restriction Script”, page 1, figure 1 – “allow from (all | host1 host2 ...)...deny from (all | host1 host2 ...)”. MathLM does this to allow for finer control of which users and machines may obtain licenses, in order to “[control] and [distribute]...network processes” (see “What is MathLM?”), for “improved value” and “more [convenience]” (see “Benefits of Using Network Mathematica”). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow for license locking by IP address, as this creates an easier-to-control distribution system. A person having ordinary skill in the art would understand this to be advantageous, namely that administrators would be able to directly modify licenses, creating a more powerful system);

Art Unit: 4137

16. wherein the access rules are used to determine whether to allow the member to change the IP address at which the owner of the software licenses is locked, in response to member input (¶60 - “a content owner...wishes to restrict what the user can do with such distributed digital content...may wish to restrict the user from copying and re-distributing such content to a second user...”; ¶62 - “allows an owner of digital content to specify license rules that must be satisfied before such digital content is allowed to be rendered on a user’s computing device...”; finally, see generally ¶48, ¶49, ¶58-67, ¶71, and ¶72; ¶110 - “the SRL can be republished if the user of the content has been granted sufficient permission to do so. That is, if allowed, the user may alter rights data within the SRL...”; also, inherent in the art of Digital Rights Management)
17. access rules set to allow some group members to see but not modify software license data (¶110 - “the SRL can be republished if the user of the content has been granted sufficient permission to do so. That is, if allowed, the user may alter rights data within the SRL...”);
18. access rules set to restrict access based on inputted field information (figure 12, reference numbers 1202, 1204);
19. selected access rules allows a group member to access a digital record and adjust the rights associated with the software license (¶110 - “the SRL can be republished if the user of the content has been granted sufficient permission to do so. That is, if allowed, the user may alter rights data within the SRL...”);
20. group administration application produces reports concerning software licenses of the group (claim 25, “locating the listing for the group in the directory based on the identifier of the group...”);

Art Unit: 4137

21. configuration information for the computers running software associated with the software licenses are stored in the digital records (figure 11, reference numbers 13, 16, “rules and requirements”).

Response to Arguments

22. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- a. US Patent 6,330,560 (Harrison et al);
- b. Internet Archive Wayback Machine archive of Wolfram Research's website, archived 2001. Various pages ("What is Network Mathematica?", "Q&A");
- c. "NEW PRODUCTS TOOLS FOR SCHOOLS", Curriculum Administrator, November 1999. Establishes lower bound on release date of the Mathematica 4 product (at least before November 1999);
- d. "Lock IT Down: Tracking software usage with SMS 2.0 Software Metering", 30 March 2000. Techrepublic.com;
- e. "Options for MathLM", Wolfram Research. Deals with Mathematica version 4.

Art Unit: 4137

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher C. Johns whose telephone number is (571)270-3462.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9 am to 5 pm.

25. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Fischer can be reached on (571) 272-6779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

26. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Christopher C Johns
Examiner
Art Unit 3621

CCJ

/Calvin L Hewitt II/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3685